



ATLANTA

CLEVELAND

DAYTON

WASHINGTON, D.C.

CINCINNATI

COLUMBUS

NEW YORK

August 22, 2018

Honorable Denise L. Cote
United States District Court
Southern District of New York
500 Pearl Street
New York, New York 10007

Re: *SEC v. Alpine Securities Corp.*, 17 cv 04179 DLC RLE

Dear Judge Cote:

I write in response to the Plaintiff's request for a two week enlargement of time, to September 14, 2018, to file the reply in support of the motion for summary judgment [ECF No. 161] – a period equal to the total amount of time that Defendant had to accomplish both expert discovery and the preparation and filing of the opposition.

It is Defendant's position that this Court has already considered and ruled on the schedule relating to the SEC's Motion, including the time for the SEC's reply. As the Court may recall, Defendant's counsel tried, but failed, to obtain the SEC's agreement to a schedule that would have enabled the defense to complete expert discovery *prior to* our time to prepare the opposition. Because we could not reach an agreement, we presented the issue to the Court which then set a schedule that forced the defense simultaneously to conduct expert discovery **and** prepare and file our opposition in a very limited time frame. As a result, defense counsel worked around the clock, preparing for and traveling to D.C. to conduct those depositions while also filing our opposition to the motion less than two weeks later.

The SEC now seeks a total of four weeks to file a reply brief, even though it has clearly stated its position that this Court's prior decision, combined with the SEC's expert's declaration, resolves the relevant issues. A response to the opposition on those points should not require additional time. Even if the SEC wants to now, for the first time, try to address the contents of the SARs and the SAR files, which would seem to underscore the existence of substantial factual issues, we have already culled and provided the materials and a response to those materials



Honorable Denise L. Cote
August 22, 2018
Page 2

would not require more than two weeks. For these reasons, it is our position that the SEC should also work within the schedule that this Court previously ordered.

We appreciate the Court's consideration in this matter.

Very truly yours,

/s/Maranda E. Fritz

Maranda E. Fritz

cc: All Counsel of Record (via ECF)